IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA **EASTERN DIVISION**

| VIS, |) | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Plaintiff, |) | | | |
| |) | Civil A | ction No. 3:06 | -CV-544-WHA |
| WALLACE HUNTER, | | | | |
| Defendants. |) | | | |
| SPECIAL IN | <u>TERROGAT</u> | ORIES TO | THE JURY | |
| ou find by a preponderar | nce of the evic | lence: | | |
| Defendants have proved ASOP 12? | that the Plain | tiff's telepho | one call to May | or Hardin was a |
| YES YES | | NO | | |
| ter exhausting the intern | al chain of co | mmand in th | ne Phenix City | henix City, a Fire Department |
| ne City Council? | X_ | _YES | | NO |
| ayor Hardin or other Cit | y Council me | mbers indivi _ YES | dually? | NO |
| ne media? | X | _YES | | NO |
| n concerning the propos isrupted or impeded the kelihood of disrupting or | ed ordinance to operations of | to extend the the Phenix (| e probationary City Fire Depar | period for new tment, or had a |
| | X | YES | | NO |
| | Plaintiff, TY, ALABAMA, and H WALLACE HUNTER, capacities, Defendants. SPECIAL INT ou find by a preponderant Defendants have proved ASOP 12? YES Defendants have proved fer exhausting the interm without obtaining prior place City Council? fayor Hardin or other City and the media? Defendants have proved an concerning the proposisrupted or impeded the | Plaintiff, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, TY, ALABAMA, and H.H. WALLACE HUNTER, in capacities, Defendants. SPECIAL INTERROGAT ou find by a preponderance of the evid Defendants have proved that the Plain ASOP 12? X YES Defendants have proved that under the der exhausting the internal chain of co without obtaining prior permission to me City Council? X ayor Hardin or other City Council me X are media? Defendants have proved that the teleph n concerning the proposed ordinance of isrupted or impeded the operations of kelihood of disrupting or impeding the | Plaintiff, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, Civil A Civil A Civil A Property ALABAMA, and H.H. WALLACE HUNTER, in capacities, Defendants. SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES TO ou find by a preponderance of the evidence: Defendants have proved that the Plaintiff's telephotasop 12? YES NO Defendants have proved that under the policies and the exhausting the internal chain of command in the without obtaining prior permission to the following the City Council? YES ayor Hardin or other City Council members indiving YES are media? YES Defendants have proved that the telephone converse nonconcerning the proposed ordinance to extend the isrupted or impeded the operations of the Phenix Of the Individual Council Of the | Plaintiff, Plaintiff, Civil Action No. 3:06 TY, ALABAMA, and H.H. WALLACE HUNTER, in capacities, Defendants. SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY ou find by a preponderance of the evidence: Defendants have proved that the Plaintiff's telephone call to May ASOP 12? YES NO Defendants have proved that under the policies and practices of Pier exhausting the internal chain of command in the Phenix City without obtaining prior permission to the following: The City Council? YES Tayor Hardin or other City Council members individually? YES The media? YES Defendants have proved that the telephone conversation between n concerning the proposed ordinance to extend the probationary isrupted or impeded the operations of the Phenix City Fire Departs telephone of the Phenix of the Pheni |

Note: if you answered Yes to questions 1, 2 a, b, and c, and 3, you need not answer question 4. The foreperson should sign and date the form. Otherwise, go to question 4.

| 4. That the Plaintiff has proved that he suffedischarging the Plaintiff from his employment | ered damages as a result of the Defendants' action in the with the Phenix City Fire Department? | in |
|---|---|----|
| YES | NO | |
| 5. If you answered Yes to question 4, in wha | at amount? | |
| | Net losses of wages and benefits \$ | |
| | Emotional pain and mental anguish \$ | |
| | | |

SO SAY WE ALL.

FOREPERSON Min Klubh March 6, 2008 DATE